

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X

SHRIKUMAR PODDAR, individually and as
plan administrator and trustee;
MAYURIKA PODDAR, individually and as
trustee; VAISHNAVA CENTER FOR
ENLIGHTENMENT, INC., d.b.a.
INTERNATIONAL SERVICE SOCIETY; and
INDIA FOUNDATION, INC. on behalf of
themselves and all others similarly
situated,

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Plaintiffs,

98 Civ. 1691 (MGC)

-against-

STATE BANK OF INDIA,

Defendant.

-----X

CEDARBAUM, J.

Plaintiffs move for reconsideration of my June 14, 2006
order on their motion for class certification. Local Rule 6.3
requires that those who seek reconsideration demonstrate that the
court has "overlooked matters or controlling decisions which, had
they been considered, might reasonably have altered the result."
Donahue v. Pendleton Woolen Mills, Inc., 719 F. Supp. 149, 151
(S.D.N.Y. 1988) (internal quotation marks omitted). A motion for
reconsideration "is not intended as a vehicle for a party
dissatisfied with the Court's ruling to advance new theories that
the movant failed to advance in connection with the underlying
motion, nor to secure a rehearing on the merits with regard to

issues already decided." Montanile v. Nat'l Broad. Co., 216 F. Supp. 2d 341, 342 (S.D.N.Y. 2002). Because plaintiffs have not satisfied the standard for reconsideration, the motion is denied. Furthermore, plaintiffs' new and vague request for additional discovery is not a ground for reconsideration.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: New York, New York
July 26, 2006

S/ _____
MIRIAM GOLDMAN CEDARBAUM
United States District Judge